DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 821 CE 029 898

AUTHOR Combs, Paul W.; McGough, Robert L.
TITLE Effective Evaluation for CETA Programs.
INSTITUTION Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg. Div. of Vocational-Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY Governor's Employment and Training Council, Richmond, Va.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 32p.; For related documents see CE 029 895-906.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Definitions; Educational Cooperation; *Evaluation Methods; *Models; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reports
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Context Input Process Products Evaluation Model; Linkage

ABSTRACT

This monograph is one of 12 that address various topics in the area of CETA/education linkages. They were designed to provide those individuals interested in the development and implementation of CETA/education linkages with information that will serve to enhance the quality of existing programs and facilitate the efficient and effective development of new programs. The purpose of this monograph is to clear up some of the misconceptions about evaluation, redefine the concept, and suggest a means by which effective evaluation of CETA programs can be carried out. Evaluation models discussed include judgmental, goal-attainment, and decision-management. This paper takes the position that a decision-management approach can provide effective evaluation for CETA programs. A particular decision-management approach is examined: the CIPP model (Context, Input, Process, and Product). A suggested format for the final evaluation report is provided. (CT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205821

EFFECTIVE EVALUATION FOR CETA PROGRAMS

by
Paul W. Combs
and
Robert L. McGough

Published by
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Division of Vocational & Technical Education
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
Sponsored and Funded
by
Governor's Employment and Training Council

CE 029 898

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Scherer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert L. McGough, Ph.H., is currently a member of the faculty of the division of Vocational and Technical Education, of Virginia Tech. He is a specialist in Manpower (employment and training) and special needs occupational training. Dr. McGough is a nationally recognized Employment and Training and Special Needs consultant. He has over 13 years experience in various administrative positions relating to disadvantaged training design and operation. He has administered both the Department of Labor sponsored disadvantaged training programs, and those under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

He has been nationally involved in employment and training services as the Executive Director for two area manpower institutes for the development of staff (AMIDS). Dr. McGough has over 40 publications in the employment and training area and has administered over 56 funded contracts relating to the development and administration of programs for disadvantaged youth and adults.

Paul W. Combs received his B.A. from the University of Tennessee and M.S.ed. in Vocational-Technical Education from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. He is currently completing doctoral coursework at Virginia Tech where he plans to conduct research in the area of employment and training programs.

Mr. Combs began his career in vocational education as an Industrial Cooperative Training Coordinator in the Virginia Beach City Public Schools. Other experiences include planning various workshops for CETA education personnel, publishing a CETA/Education Linkages newsletter, and assisting in the administration of CETA grants.

He has developed a number of training plans and learning activity packages for use in Industrial Cooperative Training programs. His conference presentations include Client-Directed Placement and Effective Curriculum Designs for CETA service recipients.

FOREWORD

Since the enactment of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), 1973, there has been acontinued need to develop cooperative relationships between (1) local prime sponsors, (2) public and private educational institutions, and (3) community based organizations. While this concern seems to exist for a variety of reasons, it is commonly recognized that poor communication is a major barrier to effective cooperative relationships in Employment and Training (CETA). This problem continues as little information has been disseminated providing ideas or models for the collaboration of efforts in the employment and training field. The provisions of both CETA and the Vocational Education Act of 1976 have noted this problem.

Recently, the Virginia Governor's Employment and Training Council funded a three phase project titled: "Inservice, Technical Assistance, and Information Dissemination Service for CETA/Education Linkages." One phase of this project provided for the development and dissemination of twelve monographs. The monograph series addresses various topics in the area of CETA/Education Linkages. The purpose of the monographs is to provide those individuals interested in the development and implementation of CETA/Education Linkages with information that will serve to enhance the quality of existing programs and facilitate the efficient and effective development of new programs.

1. EFFECTIVE EVALUATION FOR CETA PROGRAMS

Introduction

There is one word which, mentioned to a CETA administrator, is likely to bring about a wider range of emotional response than any other. The word: evaluation. The responses range from a resigned acceptance to outright resentment. Other administrators may feel that evaluation is a process over which they have no control with a troupe of outsiders coming through the building, others may regard evaluation as a prolonged self-study done with little rhyme or reason. What becomes clear is that "evaluation" is an often-misunderstood concept. The type of evaluation we wish to examine has none of the characteristics just described. The purpose of this paper is to clear up some of the misconceptions about evaluation, redefine the concept, and suggest a means by which effective evalution of CETA programs can be carried out.

It's part of our nature as humans to constantly evaluate the activities we engage in. "That old car was a lemon," "Well, the movie was okay, but the book was better," or "Now that was a good meal," are expressions heard every day. In each of these expressions, a judgment was made of the value or worth of something. By the same token, participants in CETA-funded programs also evaluate the training they receive, and administrators of those programs should not

forget that fact. If CETA programs are to be effective and if clients are to evaluate them highly in terms of personal meaning, an evaluation must be conducted to assess the programs' current value to clients, so appropriate modifications can be made. Of course, CETA programs are somewhat more complex than a car purchase or restaurant meal, and the evaluation procedures associated with these programs will be more complex as well. This monograph will point out some important considerations in effective program evaluation.

Why Evaluate?

In any serious discussion of why CETA programs should be evaluated, the bottom line is funding and program quality. A number of persuasive reasons in favor of systematic evaluation procedures can be elicited from these two considerations. In a perceptive analysis of the present and future trends in vocational education, Gilli (1976) points out that funding in many states is accomplished through increasing demands for cooperative vocational activities that maximize vocational offerings for the states' citizens and minimize duplicated efforts. Moreover, under provisions of the CETA act, the control of funds is vested with a network of prime sponsors who have been willing, if necessary, to bypass the existing public school system to contract with new educational configurations. Passing federal funds through prime sponsors increases the ease with which these newly-formed vocational institutions can strongly bid for funds to conduct certain aspects of the manpower training effort. The entry of these new local education agencies into the funding

picture (Gilli, pp. 252-53), means that a finite amount of CETA dollars will be sought every year by an increasing number of potential contractees. Again, there is a need for all existing CETA programs to demonstrate a high degree of accountability if they are to have their funding continued. Whatever the circumstances, CETA programs have both the responsibility and opportunity to demonstrate that accountability through a program of evaluation.

Accountability is the presentation of a program's results (positive terminations, GED's attained, etc.) in relation to incurred costs and established objectives (Wentling, 1980, p. 22). On the local level, program administrators can't afford the luxury of operating solely on the basis of what they believe is right. Because the public is asked to invest its money in manpower training, there has to be a responsiveness for the procedures in CETA programs to be justified on the basis of efficiency ("Evaluate your Vocational Program," 1978, p. 3).

In keeping with our understanding of evaluation as a process whereby a program's worth is ascertained and modifications are suggested, other reasons for evaluating CETA programs begin to emerge. The objective data produced by a systematic evaluation can be used to aid in planning and to determine whether existing objectives are appropriate. Decision-making is facilitated because evaluation provides information concerning personnel assignment, client selection, program changes, and contractual arrangements. Evalu-

ation, then, can be the basis for improved program operation. What this process all leads up to is what has been called "the most important goal evaluation can assume--" improved services for recipients (Wentling, pp. 19-21).

TYPES OF EVALUATION

CETA professionals who wish to undertake a thorough program evaluation need to be aware that there are many different kinds of evaluations that can be utilized. The decision as to which of these evaluation models to use is analogous to taking a trip: once a traveler knows where he wants to go, he has to decide how he'll get there. Will he drive or fly? Will he take the scenic route or the most direct one? In other words, the traveler who plans his trip in advance can make sure that his journey meets his particular needs. It's the same with the CETA professional: Almost any evaluation model will evaluate a particular program. If evaluation is mapped out in advance, an educator can decide what information is needed, what data has to be generated, and how the results will be used.

For purposes of our discussion, the evaluation models in the current literature can be one of three types. A brief description of each will be given for those CETA personnel planning a program evaluation.

Judgmental Models

The evaluation models developed by Lee Cronbach, Michael Scriven, and Robert Stake have been termed "judgmental"

because, in effect, the evaluator becomes a judge. The chief idea in these models is to establish or justify the worth of a program through a process of formal inquiry. An evaluator or evaluation team will likely observe a certain program and gather subjective and descriptive data from a number of sources. This data will then be combined in a report which gives a single, overall rating of program quality.

Although the judgmental models take an entire program into account, the outcome of this type of evaluation is largely dependent upon the program's objectives. With these models, the value of a program's goals themselves will be judged and the evaluator(s) will take particular note to see if they are being met. In this procedure, specific areas of success and failure can be identified.

Judgmental models are largely a concept and have a very general structure. Because CETA programs differ, specific data-collection devices and decision-making matrices must be custom-designed to best address the evaluation needs of a particular program. Although this process may create local methodological problems in designing an appropriate evaluation, a judgmental model can insure a systematic evaluation of virtually any type of CETA program (Worthen and Sanders, 1973, pp. 210- 211).

Goal-Attainment Models

As their name implies, the goal-attainment models involve a comparison of program objectives with program products to answer the question, "How well have program goals been attained?" Robert L. Hammond and Malcolm Provus have each developed evaluation models to carry out such a comparison, and in this sense, evaluation is designed to point out discrepancies between program standards and client performance.

A distinguishing characteristic of these models is an evaluator who comes from outside the program being evaluated. His position as an outsider allows the evaluator to objectively analyze a program's objectives by defining them in behavioral terms, classifying them, and suggesting ways in which achievement of the objectives can be demonstrated. He then chooses and implements a method of data collection and interprets the data inlight ofthe program's stated goals. Analysis of these two groups of information thus points out where improvement is needed.

The evaluator in a goal-attainment model does not work alone, however. He may set up and direct the efforts of an evaluation team and coordinate their activities with the administration of ar institution. In this manner, continuous feedback and appraisal is generated throughout the evaluation process. However, these benefits must be weighed against the expense of hiring an outside consultant as well as the time commitment of a well-articulated staff. (Worthen

& Sanders, pp. 210-215).

Decision-Management Models

David L. Stufflebeam and Marvin C. Alkin are two names associated with Decision-Management Evaluation. To Stufflebeam

> evaluation is defined as the ascertainment of value, and decision as the act of making up one's mind. When a decision-maker needs to make up his mind he obviously is faced with competing alternatives. To choose one over the other(s) . . . he must evaluate the alternatives he is faced with so he can choose the best one (cited in Worthen & Sanders, 1973).

The role of the evaluator, then, is to work at the discretion of the decision-maker, generating relevant and needed information without necessarily evaluating what he sees.

Decision-Management Evaluation is flexible in its implementation: it can be utilized in assessing either an entire program or any of its components. Of interest to CETA program operators may be the fact that this model can be implemented at any point in a program or designed to operate concurrently with a funding cycle (Worthen & Sanders, pp. 210-215). Like the other types of models, Decision-Manage-

ment has no hard-and- fast methodology. Instead, administrators who evaluate their own programs will develop their own procedures and instruments.

An Evaluation Model for CETA Programs

As previously stated "evaluation", as it is defined in this monograph is a process initiated by a local CETA program to both improve its offerings to its clients and demonstrate its fiscal accountability. In this sense, evaluation is much like a self-study whose process can be administered like any other phase of a program. The decision must still be made, however, as to which type of evaluation will be utilized in a CETA program.

The thumbnail descriptions of the different evaluation models should provide some insights. While the judgmental models allow for systematic data-collection and can provide a decision as to whether a program is "good" or "bad," there are no means of determining whether such a judgment is valid. CETA programs need more objective data to make a strong case for continued funding. The goal-attainment models, on the other hand, are capable of providing objective data. Yet if the object of evaluation is to develop a statement of accountability, it may be difficult to justify the expenditures associated with goal-attainment methodology. A simple process of elimination, then, will cause us to examine Decision-Management Evaluation more closely.

Our decision to utilize a Decision-Management approach doesn't have to be by default, however. We have already

seen how such a model can be utilized with any aspect of program operation. If that is the case, information can be provided which can make decisions about program planning, implementation, and outcomes much easier. Although CETA professionals are well-advised to examine alternative evaluation models for applicability, this monograph takes the position that a Decision- Management approach can provide effective evaluation for CETA programs.

CIPP Model

In 1970, Daniel L. Stufflebeam developed a comprehensive decision-management model for program evaluation, the CIPP model. This model, maintains that any program contains four major areas in which decisions are made: 1) Planning, 2) Programming, 3) Implementing, and 4) Recycling. Wentling describes these areas as follows:

> Planning decisions are those which focus on needed improvements by specifying the domain, major goals, and specific objectives to be served. Programming decisions specify procedures, personnel, facilities, resources, and time requirements for implementing the planned program. Implementing decisions include those which direct programmed activities. Recycling decisions include those necessary to terminating, sustaining, adjusting, or drastically modifying the educational program or its parts (p. 31).

Because program decisions are made in each component area, evaluation of each area can be carried out to provide appropriate information. Stufflebeam refers to these areas as Context, Input, Process, and Product, hence the anagram CIPP.

Context Evaluation. Context evaluation is general and systematic and is conducted during the planning phase of a program or course. It defines the environment in which a program will take place, discovers that environment's unmet needs, identifies the constraints and problems which may prevent needs from being met, and analyzes the existing ways of addressing those needs (Wentling, p. 32). More specifically, community surveys are usually called for to determine the need for a particular type of trained employee as well as the employment needs of individuals within the area.

Goal formulation can also be addressed by context evaluation. The decisions are based on the findings of a community assessment and tend to be more realistic than some generally agreed-upon objectives. This type of information is especially valuable in a CETA program because it will usually appear in the introductory section of proposals to CETA- funding agencies (Stufflebeam, cited in Worthen & Sanders, 1973).

Input Evaluation. In most requests for proposals (RFP's), CETA-funding agencies seek a statement concerning an institution's capability to deliver requested services.

This information can be provided by input evaluation, which assesses institutional capabilities to achieve identified goals and objectives (Wentling, p. 33). This type of assessment is carried out by determining how to utilize the available resources and strategies for achieving program objectives. Consideration must be given to time and budget requirements, potential procedural barriers, the consequences and costs of not overcoming these barriers, and relevance of program designs to meet the stated objectives (Stufflebeam cited in Worthen & Sanders).

Input evaluation is thus likely to be more specific than context evaluation and provides information about the appropriate instructional design to use.

Process Evaluation. After a plan of action is put into operation, process evaluation is enacted to detect strengths and weaknesses of the instrument and provide appropriate feedback to the decision-maker. Wentling describes this phase of evaluation as determining "if the program or course is being implemented as originally planned" (p. 34). This type of evaluation may be carried out by a person charged with the responsibility of measuring client performance, instructor effectiveness, staff relationships, and logistical concerns. Through any number of appropriate instruments, objective data is collected to be shared regularly with all concerned parties. Moreover this data will help to modify the program or course of study as needed, and maintain a comprehensive file of procedural information. This

type of information is valuable in documenting institutional capability for future funding cycles as well as maintaining current effectiveness.

Product Evaluation. The main reason for conducting a product evaluation is to determine the extent to which program objectives have been met as reflected by the program product, or client. In competency-based programs, product evaluation typically occurs when a criterion-based test is administered to measure the extent to which a client has achieved specified objectives. In order to determine the overall effectiveness of a CETA program, however, client followup and employer survey studies are often utilized. Product evaluation thus calls for the comparison of these measurements with program objectives to allow the decision-maker to determine whether the program should be extended, eliminated, or modified.

The CIPP appraoch to evaluation is clearly an improvement over piecemeal, inefficient means of gathering meaningful data. It seems that if CETA programs are to operate as an ongoing educational system, they should have a systematic process of evaluation. By providing comprehensive information from program planning to monitoring former CETA clients, CIPP can provide relevant and usable information about maintaining program quality. The CETA professional need not feel threatened by this evaluation which is simply designed to generate such data.

CIPP, however, is not a package that can be bought and put into place right away. It is generalizable to the point that evaluation procedures can be structured at the local level to meet perceived needs: any number of people can be involved and the data-collection instruments utilized can differ greatly from program to program. Thus there is always a danger in utilizing a CIPP evaluation. That is, the resulting data may be inappropriate for improvement of a particular program.

Nevertheless, this monograph seeks to suggest a means by which effective evaluation can be carried out. The evaluation model which follows is a CIPP approach and is presented in general terms. Local CETA programs should be able to use this framework to design an evaluation to meet their particular needs.

Application of CIPP to CETA Programs

If evaluation of CETA programs is to be as comprehensive and effective as possible, it should be designed to both develop a statement of accountability and improve program offerings for clients. Therefore, it is suggested that all the sub-evaluations associated with CIPP--Context, Input, Process, and Product evaluations--be utilized to provide the decision-maker with the information that is needed in this regard. In this sense, evaluating a CETA program with the CIPP model means that four evaluations will be conducted. With this information in mind, we can now begin to design an evaluation plan for CETA programs.

Evaluation Overview

If evaluation is to proceed in a systematic manner and generate pertinent data, the process must be given a general direction. For this reason, it is suggested that plans for an on-going evaluation be included in CETA program planning. Most CETA programs are funded on an annual basis, and evaluation should be conducted concurrently with the program. Moreover, because evaluation is to be operated as a program component, it must be administered as such. Therefore, a well-defined evaluation team must be established with each member having specific responsibilities.

For purposes of CETA program self-evaluation, a team of six persons is recommended to serve on the team:

One administrator of the institution offering the program.

Two instructors within the institution.

One advisory committee member if an entire program is being evaluated or one craft committee member in cases of course evaluation.

These four persons will comprise the "local team."

In addition, two CETA professionals from other programs

should be included as members of the evaluation team. Together with the local team, these "outside evaluators" make up the entire team.

At the beginning of the program funding cycle, the entire team should meet to develop an evaluation schedule or a plan to carry out the evaluation design. The team should also review members' responsibilities, reporting procedures, and review the evaluation budget.

The evaluation team must realize that each of the four evaluations to be conducted must have a general framework. The following is suggested to give direction to the various evaluations:

A. Focus the evaluation. Objectives should be formulated for each evaluation to be conducted. After objectives have been decided, specific tasks should be identified by which the evaluation objective can be accomplished and a determination made as to whether the objective was met or not.

B. Collect information. In any evaluation, it is important to collect the right kind of data. In this part of the evaluation framework, the entire team will determine the source of the information, and either decide upon an appropriate instrument to use or develop one of their own. Included with this phase of evaluation is determining a schedule for collecting data.

C. Organize and Analyze the information. After the data have been collected for each evaluation, the information has to be written in a descriptive manner so it can be communicated to the decision-maker. Material for writing recommendations is also generated in this phase.

D. Reporting the Information. Each evaluation activity in CIPP will produce a report of a slightly different type. In reporting, the findings of the evaluation team are summarized in narrative style and copies of all instruments used are included. The report following Product Evaluation, it should be noted, summarizes the entire evaluation process (Stufflebeam cited in Worthen & Sanders).

With this overview of a CIPP evaluation, we can now examine a suggested application of it for CETA programs.

CIPP EVALUATION

Context evaluation. In planning a CETA program or revising an existing one to better serve the client population, operators of a CETA program would want to know something about both the clients and the community served. To give focus to context evaluation, an appropriate objective might be, "Evaluation will indicate how the program can best meet the needs of the client in relation to the community." This objective can be accomplished, for example, through two tasks: a community assessment can be undertaken to deter-

mine employer needs for CETA-trained people. In addition, potential and current trainees can be surveyed to determine their needs and interests. Although the objective and its associated tasks are only suggestions here, if the evaluation team had decided upon them, they would have a direction in which to work. Instruments could then be located or developed and data collected from the target populations.

This phase of evaluation can adaquately be carried out by the local evaluation team, who would be in a solid position to identify appropriate employers and client groups. (Involving the outside evaluators here may incur additional expenses for travel and logistics and they are not recommended in this situation.) When data have been collected from the employers and clients, a report should then be written according to the following format:

I. Abstract - a brief summary of the total report containing major findings.

II. Need for the Survey - as indicated by the need for an accountability statement and improved services.

III. Survey strategies - including copies of the instruments used by the team.

IV. Findings - presented in summative, narrative style.

V. Conclusions and recommendations - describing perceived employment and client needs in relationship to cur-

rent program status and possible changes ("Prepare for a Community Survey," 1978, pp. 50-51).

Context evaluation in this case can be carried out in three months, from October through December.

Input Evaluation. In this particular model of evaluation, input evaluation will be concerned with establishing program objectives both in line with the CETA institution's capability to deliver them and in accordance with community needs. An objective such as, "Evaluation will generate suitable objectives to meet perceived needs and facilitate instruction," is all that is really needed to bring this phase of input evaluation into focus. Because this is the case, the data generated by a context evaluation described above can be utilized here. Thus, an appropirate task would be to analyze the generated data to develop program objectives.

Objectives can be developed according to this format:

I. Develop a goal to describe the intentions of all parties involved.

II. List the performances which must be done to achieve the goal.

III. List the criteria to which instructor and client would agree that the objective has been achieved.

IV. Eliminate the criteria which are too general, not behavioral, or are inconsistent with policies ("Develop Program Goals," 1978, pp. 20-21).

Here the entire evaluation team should meet in consultative session to develop the program's objectives. Having outside personnel in such a meeting will bring both a fresh view to an institution's objectives and additional expertise. Moreover, professionals from two programs may better identify possible inconsistencies with CETA regulations.

Reporting procedures for this objective will be a final list of objectives agreed upon by the entire team. This phase of Input evaluation can take place in two months, January and February.

Input evaluation, it will be recalled, is also concerned with utilizing a program's available resources and strategies to achieve its objectives. For this reason, an additional suggested objective would be, "Evaluation will indicate the relative effectiveness of materials currently in use and proposed for use. This objective thus defines a task: a curriculum materials assessment will be undertaken. A number of curriculum materials assessment devices exist, and it is suggested that the local evaluation team choose one, and conduct an evaluation of all present materials as well as those proposed for purchase throughout the year. A final report will consist of a file of completed evaluation forms.

Process Evaluation. If overall services to clients are to be improved, it is obvious that the instructors themselves will have to be evaluated in actual teaching situations. Process Evaluation can be focused by the objective, "Evaluation will assess current teaching methodology and indicate where instructional procedures can be improved." The task indicated by this objective might be, fo example, "Instructors will be observed in the classroom and teaching behaviors will be discussed with them."

In order to accomplish this Process Evaluation, it is recommended that the outside evaluators only be involved in the observation phase. Having the outside personnel conduct this evaluation means that a peer evaluation can be held without the drawbacks--the "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours"-- that may be associated with in-school personnel evaluations.

A number of instruments exist for evaluation of instructional personnel and selection of an appropriate instrument should be left to the outside team. A schedule for observation visits should be determined at the beginning of the funding cycle. Then, reporting procedures need only consist of forwarding a copy of the completed evaluation instrument to the administrator for use in consulting with the instructors affected.

Product Evaluation. In order to determine the value of a CETA program for its clients, a study of former clients of the existing program is essential. Product Evaluation is thus focused by an objective such as "Evaluation will assess program value as seen by former clients." An appropriate task which would give direction to the evaluation team is, "A followup study of former clients will be conducted."

It is suggested that the local team only be involved in this phase of evaluation: they are in a better position than the outside team to identify program leavers and can draft letters and a survey instrument at a convenient meeting time. Data from program leavers can be collected by mailing questionnaires, coordinating subsequent mailings and reminders, and updating address lists ("Conduct a Student Follow-Up," 1978, p. 17).

After a cutoff date for response has passed, the date will be analyzed by tallying responses across the questionnaires. A report will then be written according to the following format:

I. Objectives of the program being studied.

II. Methodology

A. Description of program

B. Sample obtained

C. Data-collection methods

III. Data interpretation and conclusions ("Conduct a Student Follow-Up," p. 13).

In the interest of maintaining an on-going evaluation process, the information gathered from the client follow-up should be maintained and be utilized as an element of Context Evaluation at the beginning of the next year's program evaluation cycle. This Product Evaluation can take place from May through August.

FINAL REPORT

The final evaluation report, it will be recalled, can be written following product evaluation. This is the document which summarizes the entire evaluation process for the benefit of the decision-maker in the CETA program. It is also made available by the evaluation team to describe the activities undertaken and to disseminate the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

A suggested format is as follows:

I. Abstract--occupying one or two pages, identifies the program and concisely summarizes the objectives, findings, conclusions, etc.

II. Introductory Section

A. Introduction, giving a description of the CETA program. It may include statements of the philosophy and objectives.

B. Objectives of the evaluation, including a clear, concise listing of the objectives established in the framework of the evaluation.

C. Description of the activities, detailing each data-collection means included in the evaluation. A time schedule and other materials might be included.

D. Staff involvement, presenting information focusing on the extent and type of staff involvement. It reports the outcomes, attitudes, type of committees, functions, successes, failures, etc.

E. Citizen involvement, or facts about the advisory or craft committee members involvement with the evaluation.

III. Findings section

A. Committee activities, reporting the number, type, and scope of the activities of each member.

B. Committee recommendations, supported by collected data.

C. Follow-up studies, reporting the results and generalizations.

D. Changes related to local program evaluation, reporting upon recommendations for changes.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Conclusions - organized according to objectives that were drawn up for the evaluation.

B. Recommendations - all recommendations and future plans for evaluation should be reported in this section.

V. Appendix

A. Questionnaires

B. Checklists

C. Committee membership lists ("Evaluate your Vocational Program," 1978, pp. 33-34).

Summary

Specific program evaluation at the local level is not required as such under CETA regulations. Without evaluation, however, there is no way to assess whether a program

is doing what the regulations require it to do.

With regard to CETA considerations, an evaluation of the kind specified here allows the contracting agency to quantify exactly what the program is accomplishing. Having this type of information is quite valuable in terms of accountability and maintaining an ongoing contractual relationship between a local program and CETA.

However, there are other valuable aspects involved with such an evaluation. A thorough evaluation process is designed to spotlight strengths and weaknesses. Although not specifically addressed by CETA, a professionally-operated local program should be concerned with improving its services for its clients. When weaknesses are observed, they can be corrected. Where strengths are noted, they can be consciously maintained. This process of improving the program will have positive results in program administration, instructor effectiveness, and client attitude. It is these benefits that make evaluation especially valuable.

REFERENCES

Center for Vocational Education. Develop program goals and objectives. Module A-6. Athens, Georgia: American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials, 1978.

Center for Vocational Education. Conduct a student follow-up study. Module A-10. Athens, Georgia: American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials, 1978.

Gilli, A. C., Jr. Modern organizations of vocational education. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976.

Stufflebeam, D. L. Education evaluation and decision-making. In Worthen, B. R. & Sanders, J. R. Educational evaluation: theory and practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1973.

Wentling, T. L. Evaluating occupational education and training programs. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1980.

Worthen, B. R. & Sanders, J. R. Educational evaluation: theory and practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1973.

Published by

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Division of Vocational & Technical Education
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Sponsored and Funded

by

Governor's Employment and Training Council

COUNSELING THE CETA CLIENT

ADAPTING LOCAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR CETA CLIENTS

METHODOLOGY AND TECHNIQUES

CURRICULUM DESIGNS TO SUPPORT THE CETA SERVICE RECIPIENT

OPEN-ENTRY/OPEN-EXIT COMPETENCY-BASED PROGRAMS FOR CETA CLIENTS

ANCILLARY AND RELATED SERVICES FOR THE CETA SERVICE RECIPIENT

WHAT MAKES CETA TRAINING PROGRAMS DIFFERENT FROM TRADITIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

JOB PLACEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

ABE AND THE CETA SERVICE RECIPIENT

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES FOR TRAINING THE CETA CLIENT

TECHNIQUES FOR THE ELIMINATION OF DROPOUTS WITHIN CETA PROGRAMS

CETA PROGRAMS AND EFFECTIVE EVALUATION

The above monograph titles are available

from

Governor's Employment and Training Council
11 South 12th Street
Suite 202
Richmond, Virginia 23210